

IFT-P.24/98
hep-ph/9804422
April 1998

Concerning CP violation in 331 models *

J. C. Montero, V. Pleitez and O. Ravinez
Instituto de Física Teórica
Universidade Estadual Paulista
Rua Pamplona 145
01405-900– São Paulo, SP
Brazil

Abstract

We consider the implementation of CP violation in the context of 331 models. In particular we treat a model where only three scalar triplets are needed in order to give all fermions a mass while keeping neutrino massless. In this case all CP violation is provided by the scalar sector.

PACS numbers: 11.30.Er; 12.60.-i; 12.60.Fr

Typeset using REVTeX

*Talk given by O. Ravinez at the 7th Workshop on Particles and Fields, Morelia, Mexico, 21-27 Nov 1997.

In spite of the great efforts of theoreticians and experimentalists, the origin and the smallness of CP violation remains an open question. In the context of the standard electroweak model [1] the CP symmetry is violated in the complex Yukawa couplings [2]. Although this is an interesting feature of the model it leaves open the question of why CP is so feebly violated. Since the works of Lee and Weinberg it has been known that in renormalizable gauge theories the violation of CP has the right strength if it occurs through the exchange of a Higgs boson of mass M_H [3], *i. e.*, it is proportional to $G_F m_f^2 / M_H^2$, where m_f is the fermion mass. Since then, there have been many realizations of that mechanism in extensions of the electroweak standard model [4]. Recently, it has been proposed models with the electroweak gauge group being $SU(3)_L \otimes U(1)_N$ instead of the usual $SU(2)_L \otimes U(1)_Y$ [5,6]. One interesting feature of these sort of models is that the anomalies cancel only when all three families are taken together. Although neutrinos remain massless there is lepton-flavor violation in the interactions with doubly charged scalar and vector bosons which are present in the model. Hence, it is possible to have CP violation in that mixing matrix [7]. Another possibility is purely spontaneous CP violation through complex value for the vacuum expectation values (VEVs) for the neutral scalars. This however, only happens in the model with three triplets and one sextet [8].

Let us consider a model with 331 symmetry with exotic heavy leptons. The three leptons generations belong to $(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{3}, 0)$ representation. It means $(\nu_l, l^-, E_l^+)^T$, for $l = e, \mu, \tau$. The scalar content of the model necessary to give masses to all fermions is

$$\chi = \begin{pmatrix} \chi^- \\ \chi^{--} \\ \chi^0 \end{pmatrix} \sim (\mathbf{3}, -\mathbf{1}), \quad \rho = \begin{pmatrix} \rho^+ \\ \rho^0 \\ \rho^{++} \end{pmatrix} \sim (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1}), \quad \eta = \begin{pmatrix} \eta^0 \\ \eta_1^- \\ \eta_2^+ \end{pmatrix} \sim (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{0}). \quad (1)$$

As we said before, the neutrinos are optionally massless if we do not introduce the right-handed components.

We allow VEVs being complex numbers *i.e.*, $v_a = |v_a| \exp(i\theta_a)$, where $a = \eta, \rho$ and χ . However, it is not enough to implement CP violation. The minimization of the potential implies the conditions $\text{Im}(v_\eta v_\rho v_\chi) = 0$ and, since we can choose always two VEVs being real because of the $SU(3)$ symmetry, it means that no phase at all survive in the potential minimum [8]. However, if we allow beside the complex VEVs, the trilinear term in the potential $\alpha \epsilon_{ijk} \eta_i \rho_j \chi_k + H.c.$ (where i, j, k are $SU(3)$ indices) with the complex constant $\alpha = |\alpha| e^{i\theta_\alpha}$, the minimization of the potential in this case implies $\text{Im}(\alpha v_\eta v_\rho v_\chi) = 0$ and the relative phase, say, among α and v_χ will survive in the Lagrangian density. Hence, there are explicit CP violation in the Lagrangian. (Notice however, that CP violation also requires complex VEV's. We will assume real Yukawa couplings too.)

The lepton are assigned to the following representations:

$$\Psi_{aL} = \begin{pmatrix} \nu_{l_a} \\ l_a'^- \\ E_a'^+ \end{pmatrix}_L \sim (\mathbf{3}, 0); \quad l_{aR}'^- \sim (\mathbf{1}, -1), \quad E_{aR}'^- \sim (\mathbf{1}, +1), \quad a = e, \mu, \tau. \quad (2)$$

It is possible to absorb all phases in the leptonic mass matrix so that the symmetry eigenstates (primed fields) are related to the mass eigenstates (unprimed fields) thorough orthogonal matrices [9]

$$l_{aL}' = \mathcal{O}_{Lai}^e l_{iL}, \quad l_{aR}' = \mathcal{O}_{Rai}^e l_{iR}, \quad E_{aL}' = \mathcal{O}_{Lai}^E l_{iL}, \quad l_{aR}' = \mathcal{O}_{Rai}^E l_{iR}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3. \quad (3)$$

It is always possible to choose the CP violation to occur only through the exchange of singly and doubly charged scalar fields. (The CP violation in the neutral Higgs sector is transformed away by a redefinition of the right-handed components of the lepton fields, say $e_{iR} \rightarrow \exp(i\theta_\rho)e_{iR}$ and $E_{iR} \rightarrow \exp(i\theta_\chi)E_{iR}$.)

The Yukawa couplings of leptons with the doubly charged scalars are

$$\mathcal{L}_Y = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{|v_\rho|} \bar{E}_L (\mathcal{O}_L^E)^T \mathcal{O}_L^e M^e e_L \rho^{++} + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{|v_\chi|} e^{-i\theta_\chi} \bar{e}_L (\mathcal{O}_L^e)^T \mathcal{O}_L^E M^E E_L \chi^{++} + H.c., \quad (4)$$

where we have used $\Gamma^e = \mathcal{O}_L^e M^e \mathcal{O}_R^{eT}$, $\Gamma^E = \mathcal{O}_L^E M^E \mathcal{O}_R^{ET}$ with $M^e = \text{diag}(m_e, m_\mu, m_\tau)$; $M^E = \text{diag}(m_{E_1}, m_{E_2}, m_{E_3})$ (where $\sqrt{2}\Gamma^e/v_\rho$ and $\sqrt{2}\Gamma^E/v_\chi$ are the arbitrary Yukawa dimensionless couplings). In Eq. (4) the scalar fields are still symmetry eigenstates. In fact, there are one Goldstone boson, G^{++} and a physical one, X^{++} , we denote its mass by m_X . (In this model there is not lepton-number violation in the interactions with the neutral scalars.) We have verified that it is not possible to absorb all phases in the complete Lagrangian density. We have then CP violation through the exchange of physical scalars.

The standard model prediction for the EDM of the electron is rather small, of the order of magnitude of 2×10^{-38} e cm [10]. On the other hand, the experimental upper limit is $\leq 4 \times 10^{-27}$ e cm [11]. Hence, it is interesting that if a large value for the electron EDM (and other elementary particles) is found, it would indicate new physics beyond the standard model. If neutrino remains massless in the standard model the contribution to electric dipole moment will arise at the three loop level [10] (or, at the two level in other models with massless neutrinos [12]). In our case we have

$$d_e = -\frac{em_e}{64\pi^2 m_X^2} \sqrt{2} M_W^2 G_F \mathbf{O}_{ee} \sin(2\theta_\alpha), \quad (5)$$

where we have defined

$$\mathbf{O}_{ee} = \sum_j [(\mathcal{O}_L^e)^T \mathcal{O}_L^E]_{ej}^2 \frac{4m_{E_j}^2}{M_U^2} [F_+(m_{E_j}) + F_-(m_{E_j})], \quad (6)$$

with

$$F_\pm(m_{E_j}) = -\frac{m_X^2}{2m_e^2} \ln \frac{m_X^2}{m_{E_j}^2} + \frac{m_X^2}{2m_e^2} (m_X^2 \pm m_e^2 - m_{E_j}^2) \Delta^{-1} \ln \left[\frac{m_{E_j}^2 + m_X^2 - m_e^2 + \Delta}{m_{E_j}^2 + m_X^2 - m_e^2 - \Delta} \right], \quad (7)$$

and

$$\Delta^2 = (m_X^2 + m_{E_i}^2 - m_e^2)(m_X^2 - m_{E_i}^2 - m_e^2). \quad (8)$$

In writing Eq. (5) we have used $M_U^2 = (g^2/4)(|v_\chi|^2 + |v_\rho|^2)$ and $G_F/\sqrt{2} = g^2/8M_W^2$ where M_U is the mass of the doubly charged vector boson that is present in the model. We have chosen $\theta_\eta = \theta_\rho = 0$, and $\theta_\chi = -\theta_\alpha$.

For nondegenerate heavy leptons the mixing angles remain in Eq. (6). For instance, the contribution of E_1 , using $m_{E_1} = 50$ GeV, $m_\chi = 100$ GeV [13], we obtain

$$d_e \approx -\left(\frac{M_W^2}{M_U^2}\right) [(\mathcal{O}_L^e)^T \mathcal{O}_L^E]_{e1}^2 \sin(2\theta_\alpha) \times 10^{-17} \text{ e cm}. \quad (9)$$

Assuming $M_U = 300$ GeV and that the factor with the mixing angles (including $\sin(2\theta_\alpha)$) is $\approx 10^{-8}$ we obtain $d_e \approx 10^{-27}$ e cm, which is compatible with the experimental upper limit of 10^{-27} e cm [11].

For the muon the experimental EDM's upper limit are of the order of $< 10^{-19}$ e cm [14]. It means a constraint in $\left[(\mathcal{O}_L^e)^T \mathcal{O}_L^E\right]_{\mu 2}^2 \leq 1$. For the tau lepton a limit of 10^{-17} e cm is derived from $\Gamma(Z \rightarrow \tau^+ \tau^-)$ [15]. In the present model the EDM of the tau lepton is at least of the order of 10^{-19} e cm.

In this model there is not rare decays such as $\mu \rightarrow 3e$ at tree level. However, the same loop diagrams that contribute for the EDM of the leptons imply also magnetic and electric-moment transitions, like $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$. This transitions will constrain the matrix elements $\left[(\mathcal{O}_L^e)^T \mathcal{O}_L^E\right]_{\mu 1}^2$ only.

In the quark sector we have contributions involving the exchange of one simple charged and one doubly charged scalars in the box diagrams that contribute to the ε and ε' parameters of the neutral Kaon system. There are also contributions to the electric dipole moment of the neutron. These issues will be published elsewhere [16].

With three triplets and one sextet which are needed in the model of Ref. [5] it is possible to have truly spontaneous violation of the CP symmetry. In this case, the minimization condition of the scalar potential implies $\text{Im}(v_S v_\eta v_\rho v_\chi) = 0$ [8], with v_S the VEV of one of the neutral component of the sextet which gives mass to the charged leptons. The phenomenology of this model has been studied in Ref. [17].

REFERENCES

- [1] S. L. Glashow, Nucl. Phys. **22**, 579 (1967); S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **19**, 1264 (1967); A. Salam, *in* Elementary Particle Theory, Ed. by N. Svartholm (Almqvist and Woksell, 1968); S. L. Glashow, J. Iliopoulos and L. Maiani, Phys. Rev. **DD2**, 1285(1970).
- [2] M. Kobayashi and T. Maskawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **49**, 652 (1974).
- [3] T. D. Lee, Phys. Rev. D **8**, 1226 (1973); Phys. Rep. **9**, 143 (1974); S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **37**, 675 (1976).
- [4] Y-L. Wu and L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 1762 (1994) and references therein.
- [5] F. Pisano and V. Pleitez, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 410 (1992); R. Foot, O. F. Hernández, F. Pisano and V. Pleitez, Phys. Rev. D **47**, 4158 (1993). See also P. Frampton, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 2889 (1992).
- [6] V. Pleitez and M. D. Tonasse, Phys. Rev. D **48**, 2353 (1993).
- [7] J. T. Liu and D. Ng, Phys. Rev. D **50**, 548 (1994).
- [8] L. Epele, H. Fanchiotti, C. García Canal, D. Gómez Dumm, Phys. Lett. **B343**, 291 (1995).
- [9] G. C. Branco, Phys. Rev. Lett. **44**, 504 (1980).
- [10] F. Hoogeveen, Nucl. Phys. **B341**, 322 (1990).
- [11] E. Commins *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **50**, 2960 (1994); K. Abdullah —it et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 2347 (1990).
- [12] D. Bowser-Chao, D. Chang and W-Y. Keung, Phys. Lett. **79**, 1988 (1997).
- [13] R. M. Barnett *et al.*, (Review of Particle Physics), Phys. Rev. D **54**, 1 (1996).
- [14] J. Bailey *et al.*, J. Phys. G **4**, 345 (1978); Nucl. Phys. **B150**, 1 (1979).
- [15] R. Escribano and E. Massó, Phys. Lett. **301**, 419 (1993).
- [16] J. C. Montero, V. Pleitez and O. Ravinez, in preparation.
- [17] D. Gómez Dumm, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A11**, 887 (1996).